DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 724 IR 000 436

AUTHOR Martin, Ron G.
TITLE Current Trends of Periodical Circulation Policies Relative to Attitudes by Librarians Toward Causes of Mutilation and Theft in 92 Four-Year Colleges and Universities.
PUB DATE Aug 72
NOTE 29p.; Report of a graduate research project in Library Science, University of Missouri - Columbia; Some pages of this document may not reproduce clearly

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; *Book Thefts; College Libraries; Higher Education; Librarians; *Library Circulation; *Library Surveys; *Periodicals; Policy; Questionnaires; Security; University Libraries; *Vandalism

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to accomplish three objectives relating to periodical circulation in college and university libraries: 1) to establish present circulation policy trends, 2) to obtain attitudinal information on mutilation and theft of periodicals from serial librarians, and 3) to ascertain if there were, at present, any workable methods of preventing damage to periodicals. Four-page questionnaires were sent to 126 institutions which met the criteria of being four-year schools offering undergraduate and graduate programs, having over 1000 students, and receiving 1000-3000 current periodicals. The 92 replies were tabulated in simple percentages for each item of the questionnaire. Results indicated no correlation between size of enrollment and/or collection and the degree of mutilation of periodicals. Most libraries are not moving toward a liberal circulation policy. Librarians whose collections experienced little mutilation or theft credited this to their circulation policy, while librarians with problems in this area tended to blame the students, not their policy. Finally, despite much experimentation, no really effective security system yet exists. (SL)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 089724

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

CURRENT TRENDS OF PERIODICAL CIRCULATION POLICIES

RE[illegible] ATTITUDES BY LIBRARIANS TOWARD CAUSES OF MUTILATION A[illegible]EFT IN 92 4-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Library Science 450

Research

August 1972

by

Roy C. Martin

IR 000 436

This document was processed for the ERIC Document Reproduction Service by the ERIC Clearinghouse at Stanford. We are aware that some pages probably will not be readable in microfiche or in Hard Copy form. However, this is the best available copy, and we feel that the document should not be withheld from interested readers on the basis of these unreadable pages alone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION. . . . . .Page 1

SCOPE OF STUDY. 4

RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE. 6
Circulation Policy Statistics
Librarians' Attitudes Toward Mutilation
and Their Policies
Present Methods in Operation to Discourage
Mutilation and Theft

CONCLUSION. 18

APPENDIX A. 20

APPENDIX B. 21

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 25

INTRODUCTION

Periodical circulation policies in colleges and universities have run the gamut over the last few decades--from the conservative closed stack-noncirculation policies to the more generous systems of open stack-liberal circulation. And as policies have altered, so have the views of librarians toward the causes of mutilation and theft of periodicals. Some librarians have felt that more liberalized policies have caused more extensive mutilation while others have contended that limited circulation has been the primary culprit.

With these thoughts in mind the author speculated on the possible correlation between the particular circulation policies and the degree of mutilation and theft experienced by institutions of higher learning. In addition, little had been written on present policies in the smaller public supported colleges and universities just as a matter of statistical information, as well as later developments in the field of periodical circulation.

Consequently, one part of such a survey was factual (the policies themselves), and the other part attitudinal (the librarians' opinions of the policies as they related to mutilation and theft). It was highly unlikely that any librarian had been able to measure the exact degree of mutilation that plagued his library.

Besides the policy statistics that could be gathered and the attitudinal evidence to the degree of mutilation and theft, current methods of mutilation prevention might prove useful to serials librarians. Suffice it to say there will probably always be people who mutilate materials; there have not been any policies effected so far that have entirely stopped the cutting and snipping. Examples of mutilation and theft are evident in the library literature:

> A large high school class in Charlotte, North Carolina, was recently given an assignment on the life of John Milton. By evening every article on Milton had been cut out of every encyclopedia in the main public library. . .
>
> A year ago three high school boys drove into the rear lot of the Newark, New Jersey Public Library. One went to the second floor stacks, selected some 20 books, and threw them out of the window to the others. . .
>
> The dormitory rooms of a certain state teachers' college were searched during the Christmas holidays while the students were away and a panel-truckload of missing library books found. At another teachers' college, students have a trick of tearing a book from its binding, replacing the empty shell in the gap on the shelf as camouflage, and walking out with the guts of the book in their clothing. . .
>
> The huge Brooklyn Public Library sets its annual book loss through theft, borrowing-without-return, and mutilation at half a million dollars.[1]

Even in the Soviet Union they have problems- the libraries in the Soviet Ministry of Culture mark the annual disappearance of almost four million books.[2]

---

[1]J. C. Furnas, "Vandals in the Library," Reader's Digest, January, 1964, p. 175.

[2]R. V. Allen, "Some Problems Are International; Damaged and Defaced Books," Library of Congress Information Bulletin, [illegible] 3, 1972, p. [illegible].

And even when other students observe the mutilating they do not report it, as exemplified by the Miami University experiment where a student, purposely placed among other students, began tearing pages from books. Only 11% of those who saw him responded by either reporting the offender to the circulation desk or stopping the student from ripping the pages.[3] Most articles thus conclude that until those offenders change morally or some fool-proof control scheme is invented, those individuals who respect materials will have to live with mutilators and thieves.

Thus this author hoped to accomplish three objectives: (1) establish present circulation policy trends for periodicals; (2) obtain attitudinal information on mutilation from serial librarians; and (3) ascertain if there were any methods of prevention in operation that were working.

The author hypothesized that there would be correlation between strictness of policy and amount of mutilation and theft. Secondly, he felt there were surely some very effective methods in operation to curtail mutilation. Third, surely most libraries secured their missing periodicals from the Library of Congress' Duplicate Exchange Union which had over 300 members. And last, the author believed there were probably a good number of libraries now checking out microform materials. On all counts the study proved otherwise.

---

[3] R. A. Hoppe and E. C. Simmel, "Book Tearing and the Mutilator in the University Library," College and Research Libraries, May, 1969, p. 247.

SCOPE OF STUDY

To add relevance to the study the author chose all public supported colleges and universities comparable to the one in which he is employed--1500 currently received periodicals and 5500 full-time equivalent student enrollment. One hundred twenty-six four-page questionnaires (See Appendix B) were sent to all those institutions which qualified as follows:

1. Was a public supported four-year college or university.
2. Offered both graduate and undergraduate programs.
3. Had over 1000 full-time equivalent student enrollment.
4. Received between 1000-3000 current periodical titles.

By establishing the above limits the author was able to mail a questionnaire to every institution in the United States that qualified; one hundred twenty-six qualified. Also, by selecting particular size and type of school it was felt that a more closely representative type of student would thus add a degree of validity to the survey.

To gather the statistics the author used two United States Government Printing Office publications. For student enrollment the source used was Fall Enrollment in Higher Education 1970, Institutional Data, which gave enrollment for the 1970-71 year.[4]

---

[4] George H. Wade, Fall Enrollment in Higher Education 1970, Supplementary Information, Institutional Data (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971), pp. 2-79.

Periodical holdings statistics and types of institutions were gathered from Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, Data for Individual Institutions, Fall 1969, which produced statistics for the 1968-69 year.[5] Complete addresses of each school were obtained from the American Library Directory 1970-71,[6] and each questionnaire was mailed to the Head of the Serials Department in each library.

Along with each four-page questionnaire was attached a cover letter from Dr. Ralph Parker, Dean, School of Library and Informational Science, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, stating the purpose and scope of the study (See Appendix A). After three weeks, 92 questionnaires were returned, resulting in a respectable 73% return. In an effort to tabulate the results of each question so that the statistics could be easily be read and interpreted by those interested librarians, the author avoided detailed charts, graphs, etc. Instead, simple percentages were used whenever possible, and the paper closely follows the questions in the questionnaire, discussing results of each one, and whenever possible, showing relationships between questions. It should be stated finally, that the author felt where there was mutilation there was theft; consequently, quotations referring to either one actually related to both problems.

---

[5]Bronson Price, Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, Data for Individual Institutions, Fall 1969 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), pp. 7-42.

[6]Eleanor F. Steiner-Prag and Helaine MacKeigan, American Library Directory 1970-71, 27th Ed. (New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1970), pp. 1-993.

THE RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Through questions 1 and 2 the author requested information on student enrollment and number of periodical titles currently received by each institution. If there had been any possible correlation between the types of circulation policies and the mutilation and theft, in relation to the size of school and number of titles, these two questions would have revealed such information. The author, however, could discover no such relevant comparisons existing that would indicate a greater degree of mutilation in larger schools or collections.

In questions 3 through 7 on circulation policies, serials librarians were asked to give periodical circulation information on current periodicals and bound periodicals available to graduate and undergraduate students. Listed below are the results given in percentages of the 92 librarians who responded:

3. (a) Length of time current periodicals may be checked out to undergraduate students:

Not at all	64%
Overnight	24
2 hours	1
24 hours	0
2 days	0
3 days	1
1 week	2
2 weeks	0
Quarter	1
Special Permission	7
	100%

3. (b) Length of time current periodicals may be checked out to graduate students:

Not at all	63%
Overnight	21
2 hours	1
24 hours	1
2 days	0
3 days	1
1 week	6
2 weeks	0
Quarter	1
Special Permission	6
	100%

At this juncture it was noted that the only difference between graduate and undergraduate privileges was the advantage given to graduate students by only 6% of those schools that allowed current titles to be checked out for one week, whereas only 2% allowed undergraduates such a privilege.

3. (c) Length of time undergraduates may check out bound periodicals:

Not at all	77%
Overnight	14
2 hours	1
24 hours	0
2 days	0
3 days	1
1 week	1
2 weeks	0
Quarter	0
Special Permission	6
	100%

3. (d) Length of time graduate students may check out bound periodicals:

Not at all	73%
Overnight	14
2 hours	1
24 hours	0
2 days	0
3 days	1
1 week	3
2 weeks	0
Quarter	0
Special Permission	8
	100%

Again, graduate students were given a slight but not significant advantage in only a few institutions when checking out bound periodicals. In a similar study done by Mr. Stith M. Cain, Director of Libraries at Wisconsin State University, Whitewater, he found that the trend of 45 state and private institutions was to restrict circulation of periodical material.[7]

After stating their policy in question 3, the librarians were asked in question 4 if they were satisfied that their particular policy was the best policy for their library situation. 79% liked their present policy, 16% wanted to limit their policy to complete non-circulation of periodicals, and 5% felt a more liberal circulation policy would give better service to the patron. In general then, librarians were happy with the circulation policies that were presently in force.

Questions 5, 6, and 7 then dealt with open and closed stacks and librarians' attitudes toward their particular arrangements.

Students were able to browse through current issues in 84% of the libraries while in 16% the stacks were partially or entirely closed. Concerning bound periodicals however, 94% allowed students to browse while 6% had closed stack arrangements. So, more libraries placed restrictions on current issues than on bound volumes.

---

[7]"Survey Finds Reluctance to Circulate Mags in Academic Libraries," Library Journal, June 15, 1969, p. 2391.

Of those who had open stacks, 92% were satisfied because students had quick access to all materials, 46% appreciated the little or no supervision required to man the areas, 6% thought open stacks encouraged browsing, and two librarians felt it encouraged a feeling of responsibility in students.

Of those dissatisfied with open stacks, 20% felt there was no control over the use of the materials, 50% believed that there was more mutilation and theft than there would be with closed stacks, 15% were discouraged with materials scattered all over and misshelved, and one librarian felt there was less of a tendency for students to ask for help.

So, 92% of the librarians were happy that students had quick access to materials, although 50% of them felt mutilation was more of a problem in open stacks than in closed stacks.

90% of the librarians with closed stacks believed this arrangement was most satisfactory because there was physical control of the materials; they knew where everything was. 55% thought there was less mutilation than with open stacks. Of those criticizing closed stacks 35% were aware that students did not have quick access to materials, 20% felt the necessity of more staff to man the area was a drawback, 20% also believed there was still a degree of mutilation and loss, and one librarian was disillusioned that students had no opportunity to browse.

Summarizing, there seemed to be a feeling of satisfaction with the system most librarians were working under, whether closed or open stacks. Of particular note were those libraries with open stacks where librarians felt this arrangement encouraged a greater degree of mutilation--yet believed it was the best arrangement to serve the student and faculty.

Question 8 concerned circulation policies of microform materials. There has been discussion by librarians that someday microform materials would be checked out to students, along with available portable readers. However, relative to the 92 librarians' opinions, this liberal circulation trend would seem to be out of the picture for a long time. Below are the present circulation policies for microform materials in the 92 libraries:

Not at all	92%
Overnight	1
24 hours	0
2 days	0
1 week	1
Interlibrary loan	5
Special Permission	1
	100%

Only 7 schools allowed microforms to be taken out of the library. So they seemed to be quite content to keep the material in the library, as indicated by question 9 in which 97% were quite satisfied that their circulation policy was adequate and proper. Only 3% thought their policy should be liberalized to allow check-out. Even with convenient check-out equipment with the microforms, it would seem that a liberal policy would not be forthcoming.

The next part of the survey dealt with librarians; their attitudes toward mutilation, how they replaced lost materials, and what they did to curtail the mutilation and loss. Methods of prevention have ranged from mutilation displays to punishment of some type:

> The Philadelphia Free Library recently invoked the law against a dozen flagrant delinquents, and weekly collection of fines on over-due books jumped 300%. In 1961 East Orange made headlines when borrowers ignoring repeated warnings to return books were arrested at home in the middle of the night.[8]

"In Los Angeles an individual served a 10-day jail sentence for the mutilation of $500 worth of library books on communism."[9]

> One Library's warning was a note slipped into the book pocket which stated: 'This book is being loaned to you in good condition. Upon return it will be examined page by page for mutilation. . .[10]

This author doubts that in the libraries he surveyed anyone has the time or can afford to examine every book as it is checked in.

Question 10 thus asked if the librarians indeed did feel that they experienced considerable mutilation. The author realized that "considerable" mutilation was a nebulous term and that measurement of mutilation is difficult if not impossible.

---

[8]Furnas, "Vandals in the Library," p. 180.

[9]"Los Angeles Book Mutilator Served a Ten-Day Jail Sentence," Wilson Library Bulletin, April, 1965, p. 618.

[10]L. F. Zimmerman, "Pilfering and Mutilating Library Books," Rub-Off, January-February and March-April, 1960, p. 4.

Only indications of the degree of mutilation can be measured by the reports from students who have found materials missing.

80% of the librarians believed that their current periodicals were being considerably mutilated; 20% did not. 76% felt their bound periodicals were being cut and snipped, while 24% believed they had little problem here. And no school reported any mutilation of their microform collection.

Those who were experiencing mutilation were asked what they thought was causing it through question 11 (a). They responded as follows:

Student attitude toward materials	84%
Heavy demands upon limited number of articles	70
Copies too expensive for students	24
Open Stacks	18
Limited circulation of materials (closed stacks?)	8
Copy machines unavailable	4
Faculty not notifying library of assignments	2
No reading room	1
No supervision	1

Librarians were much in agreement (84% above) that poor student attitude was the major cause of most library losses. "There is. . . only one actual solution for the problem. This is to instill in that segment of our user population responsible for these costly depredations such a deep sense of social responsibility that they will stop this anti-social behavior."[11]

---

[11] W. L. Emerson, "Theft and Mutilation of Books," Library Journal, January 15, 1960, p. 208.

For whatever reason people mutilate materials, whether anti-social or not, they do not seem to realize or do not care that someone else may want that same material at a future time.

70% of the librarians indicated that heavy demand on a limited number of articles also was a primary cause. Many articles could be and are xeroxed and/or placed on reserve for the heavy-use period. Still, many students need an identical article, and because 24% of the librarians felt copies were too expensive, certainly the cost of copies becomes a factor. Two librarians stated that 5¢ per copy was a more reasonable fee than the more common 10¢, feeling that some mutilation could be reduced. In addition, open stacks where students could use what they wanted without permission led 18% to feel open stacks encouraged students to be destructive. Only 8% believed a strict circulation policy increased mutilation.

In (b) of question 11 librarians who felt their collections were relatively mutilation free were asked to what they attributed such success. Responses are below, by 22 libraries:

Copy machines available	100%
Heavy microfilm holdings	46
Liberal circulation policy	37
Strict circulation policy	28
Faculty cooperation on heavy-use assignments	23
Good student attitude toward materials	14
Separate reading room for periodicals	9
Turnstile exit	4
Partial supervision of reading room	4

Obviously these schools gave much credit to having copy machines available and felt that students did use them in lieu of cutting articles or stealing the entire issue or bound volume. Also interesting however, is the fact that only 14% gave students any credit for using the copy machines instead of cutting. Compare this 14% giving students credit to the 84% experiencing mutilation who blame students (see p. 12). If figures indicate anything, the student is getting little or no credit for any success in curtailing mutilation, but he is assuming the major blame when the mutilation occurs in lieu of the circulation policy or any other related reasons for mutilation. Even the heavy microform holdings were given credit in almost half(40%) of these libraries. 37% gave credit to their liberal circulation policies as a deterrent while 28% felt closed stacks provided the deterrent. Also, in 23% of those libraries they were experiencing some close relationship with instructors who were asking that materials be placed on reserve.

Question 12 then dealt with ways libraries attempted to replace cut-out pages and lost issues and bound volumes. Below were their responses:

Interlibrary loan----------80%
Microform Replacement----------47
Publishers----------46
U. S. Book Exchange----------40
Reprint companies----------39
Local or regional libraries----------26
Duplicate Exchange Union----------19
State agreements----------1

As can be seen, heavy reliance is put on interlibrary loan. When entire issues, bound volumes, or cut-out pages were missing and could not be obtained through interlibrary loan, then microform replacement and direct contact with the publisher seemed to be a common technique for replacement (47 & 46% respectively), with the U. S. Book Exchange and reprint companies following closely as sources (40 & 39% respectively). Surprisingly to the author, very few libraries (19%) used the Library of Congress' Duplicate Exchange Union, which has over 300 member libraries.

A number of exit-control systems have been tried over the years to discourage mutilation and theft of library materials, so the author was interested in any such systems that might be, in the librarians' opinions, discouraging mutilation and loss. So questions 13 through 17 dealt with exit-control. No. 13 asked if student assistants were used to man the exits, and 61% of the 92 libraries reporting had student assistants examining materials at the exits. Then in question 14 these 61% were asked if they thought student assistants substantially deterred theft and mutilation. Discouragingly, only 34% or 1/3 felt that students were effective. In a similar survey done with 52 respondents from eastern and central colleges in the U. S., less than half of the libraries were satisfied with their security systems, but that they believed turnstiles and adult-manned exits provided the best control.[12]

---

[12] "Sixty-College Security Study Finds Few Satisfied," _Library Journal_, May 1, 1968, p. 1848.

There seems to be little faith in student assistant exit-control systems.

Some libraries employed adult guards for the exits, so question 15 asked how many did. 39% of the 92 schools hired adult guards, and of that percentage only 70% felt the guards were effective. From question 17 only 30% of those who employed adult guards had them casually patrol the library.

As the previous statistics have indicated, librarians had more faith in adults as a deterrent to theft and mutilation. In extra comments by librarians on the last page of the questionnaire, some felt students had too many friends in some instances, and/or had too many students to check, especially during class changes.

Library literature contains information on electronic detection systems at exits, and although they are usually in operation in very large libraries, four smaller libraries did report such control. Comments were: "We are pleased thus far with its effectiveness. However, the desk personnel have a great deal to do with its total effectiveness,"[13] "We have taped about 60 periodicals(electronic sensitive tape) and hope to cut down on losses in this way,"[14] and "We have electronic checkpoint. Value--?"[15] Even here opinions vary and questions remain on effectiveness.

---

[13]Questionnaire-return from Respondent No. 73.

[14]Questionnaire-return from Respondent No. 55.

[15]Questionnaire-return from Respondent No. 92.

Questions 18 and 19 asked the direction in which libraries were moving to discourage mutilation and loss. No. 18 asked if libraries were moving more quickly than a few years ago to microforms. 71% of the 92 libraries reporting stated that they were indeed moving more quickly in that direction. When asked why they were purchasing more microforms (question 19), 64% stated they were especially cognizant of their own space problems in their libraries; 48% were encouraged with the savings aspect of microforms; 44% felt mutilation and loss were forcing more microform purchase; 40% believed preservation of materials was an important contributing factor; two libraries can no longer afford to bind; one librarian felt microforms were easier to locate and use; and one librarian was encouraged that more faculty were now accepting microforms. So aside from the storage problem in the libraries surveyed, almost 50% of them were moving to microforms because of mutilation and loss--it undoubtedly is a problem in the libraries surveyed, and the librarians are not content to throw up their hands in hopeless disgust. They are moving to preserve and provide a usable collection of periodical material for the patron who respects materials as well as that patron who will continue to mutilate and steal when he has the chance.

Question 20 asked for any additional comments. At least 50% made additional comments and the author wishes to thank them, for the information added much to the research.

CONCLUSION

As stated in the Introduction to the paper, the author hoped to accomplish three objectives. First, statistics showing present periodical circulation policies were established through the questions answered by serials librarians. The author found no correlation between size of enrollment and/or collection, and the degree of mutilation. Surprisingly, most libraries are not moving to a more liberal circulation policy.

Secondly, librarians' attitudes toward mutilation and theft were expressly evident. Those who experienced little mutilation and loss gave credit to their policies, while those who were plagued by considerable mutilation tended to place most of the blame on students, not their policies.

And last, a number of methods have been and/or exist in the experimental stages to curb mutilation and loss of periodical materials. Most libraries still seem to be waiting for a very effective, inexpensive system of exit-control.

As to the librarians who participated by returning the questionnaire, the results of this study may disturb them, or engrain in them a deeper determination to attempt to understand the library user--what he wants and what he will do to get it.

Librarians who might have felt that their library was unique in the mutilation it experienced can dolefully take heart that they are not alone.

The problem of mutilation, whether social or not, seems to lack the ideal solution, but the challenge is still there to give the user the best possible service and treat him with respect, which means preserving the collection so that what the student wants is always there or close by, and is conveniently available for his use for as long as he needs it.

> A library is like a bank which is run on trust but is unlike it which does not allow its customers to handle its stock. A library which is always desirous of extending its services to a larger clientele cannot keep its stacks closed to the readers or make its law rigorous, deterring its extensive use. The rules and regulations of progressive libraries are more exemplary rather than deterrent.[16]

As long as librarians can visualize this goal, so will they face the mutilation and theft problem without sacrificing the basic function of the service-oriented institution.

---

[16] Ranganathan Kumar, "Pilfering and Mutilation in Libraries," Librarian, April, 1963, p. 37.

APPENDIX A

University of Missouri - Columbia

20

Stewart Hall
Columbia, Mo. 65201

SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATIONAL SCIENCE
Office of the Dean

Telephone
314 449-9320

April 24, 1972

Dear Librarian:

A problem facing both public and private colleges and universities is the loss of periodicals through mutilation and theft. It has been of concern for many years; a number of preventive methods have been tried to thwart the loss, but little has ever been written on the successes and failures of such attempts. In addition, little has been written on the causes of this dilemma, if indeed the causes can be discovered through surveys or studies.

Ron Martin, one of our graduate students in library science, has chosen as his research project to survey librarians' attitudes and institutional circulation policies in an attempt to identify the causes of mutilation, the extent of it, and the current methods being attempted to curb it.

We ask for your sincere cooperation in completing the accompanying questionnaire. The answers to this form are confidential, and no individual or institution will in any way be identified in the final report. If you will, take a few minutes this week to complete the form and return it to us at least within the next two weeks. A self-addressed postpaid manila envelope is enclosed for your convenience in reply. Also, the research results, to be tabulated some time this summer, will be mailed to you if you will write your name and address below. We need your comments, and thank you for them.

Sincerely,

Ralph H. Parker
Dean

NAME _____
INSTITUTION _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY, STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

APPENDIX B

Periodical Circulation Policy Questionnaire

1. What is the approximate size of the student body? _____

2. What is the approximate number of periodicals currently received in the library? _____

3. (a) Length of time undergraduate students may check out current periodicals: (check one)

Not at all ____	1 week _____
Overnight ____	2 weeks ____
24 hours _____	Other (please specify) ____
2 days _____	_____

(b) Length of time graduate students may check out current periodicals:

Not at all _____	1 week _____
Overnight _____	2 weeks ____
24 hours _____	Other (please specify) ____
2 days _____	_____

(c) Length of time undergraduate students may check out bound periodicals:

Not at all _____	1 week _____
Overnight _____	2 weeks ____
24 hours _____	Other (please specify) ____
2 days _____	_____

(d) Length of time graduate students may check out bound periodicals:

Not at all _____	1 week _____
Overnight _____	2 weeks ____
24 hours _____	Other (please specify) ____
2 days _____	_____

4. Changes you feel would improve your present periodical circulation policy:

___a. like present policy
___b. extend circulation period of current periodicals for undergraduates to _____.
___c. extend circulation period of bound periodicals for undergraduates to _____.
___d. extend circulation period of current periodicals for graduates to _____.
___e. extend circulation period of bound periodicals for graduates to _____.
___f. limit circulation period of current periodicals for undergraduates to _____.
___g. limit circulation period of bound periodicals for undergraduates to _____.
___h. limit circulation period of current periodicals for graduates to _____.
___i. limit circulation period of bound periodicals for graduates to _____.
___j. other changes _____
_____.

5. (a) Are current periodicals open to student use during library hours? (open stacks)
YES _____ NO _____

(b) Are bound periodicals open to students during library hours?
YES _____ NO _____

6. (If you have open stacks, please answer this question)

(a) Open stacks of current and bound periodicals have provided the most satisfactory service because:
___1. students have quick access to all materials.
___2. requires little or no supervision (economical).
___3. other reasons _____
_____.

(b) Open stacks have not provided the most satisfactory service because:
___1. there is no control over the use of materials (supervision, records, etc.)
___2. there is more mutilation and loss than with closed stacks.
___3. other reasons _____
_____.

7. (If you have closed stacks, please answer this question)

(a) Closed stacks have proven satisfactory because:
___1. there is control of the materials.
___2. there is less mutilation of the materials.
___3. other reasons _____
_____.

(b) Closed stacks have not proven satisfactory because:
___1. students do not have quick access to materials.
___2. more staff are needed to handle student requests.
___3. there is still mutilation and loss.
___4. other reasons _____
_____.

8. Periodicals on microform may be checked out for:

Not at all _____	1 week _____
Overnight _____	2 weeks _____
24 hours _____	Other (please specify) _____
2 days _____	_____

9. Changes in your microform circulation policy that you feel would improve service without sacrificing the collection:

___a. am happy with present policy.
___b. circulation period should be extended to _____.
___c. circulation period should be limited to _____.
___d. other changes _____.

10. Do you experience considerable mutilation of the following types of materials?

a. current periodicals YES ___ NO ___
b. bound periodicals YES ___ NO ___
c. microform materials YES ___ NO ___

11. (a) If you do experience some degree of mutilation, what do you feel is causing it?

___1. limited circulation of materials.
___2. no copy machines available.
___3. copies are too expensive for students.
___4. student attitude toward materials.
___5. heavy demands upon limited articles.
___6. open stacks.
___7. other causes _____
_____.

(b) If you do not experience considerable mutilation, to what do you attribute this success?

___1. periodicals may be checked out.
___2. closed stacks.
___3. copy machines are available.
___4. student attitude toward materials.
___5. faculty notifying library when heavy use for materials is upcoming.
___6. separate reading room for periodicals.
___7. heavy microform holdings.
___8. other _____
_____.

12. If attempts are made to replace cut-out pages and missing issues, what are they?

___a. interlibrary loan.
___b. U.S. Book Exchange.
___c. Duplicate Exchange Union.
___d. local or regional libraries.
___e. publishers.
___f. reprint companies.
___g. microform replacement.
___h. other methods _____.

13. Do you have student assistants who examine students' materials as they leave the library? YES ___ NO ___

14. If yes, do you feel it is successful in substantially deterring theft? YES ___ NO ___

15. Do you have an adult to watch the exits? YES ___ NO ___

16. Do you feel the guard substantially deters theft? YES ___ NO ___

17. Does a guard patrol the library periodically? YES ___ NO ___

18. Are you moving more quickly than a few years ago to periodicals on microforms? YES ___ NO ___

19. If so, why?

___a. mutilation and theft.
___b. economy (cost).
___c. economy (space).
___d. preservation of materials.
___e. other _____.

20. The rest of this page is open for you to make any additional comments; I welcome your ideas, and thank you for them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PERIODICALS

Allen, R. V. "Some Problems Are International; Damaged and Defaced Books." Library of Congress Information Bulletin, September 3, 1970, pp. 491-92.

"Books Are Mutilated in Moscow Too." Library Journal, November 1, 1969, p. 3956.

"Brooklyn Security Men Crack Down on Mutilation." Library Journal, November 1, 1962, p. 3983.

Connell, A. "Successful Prosecution." Library Association Record, March, 1963, pp. 102-05.

Cox, J. R. "Lending Research Library." Library Journal, May 15, 1965, pp. 2219-25.

Emerson, W. L. "Theft and Mutilation of Books." Library Journal, January 15, 1960, pp. 208-09.

Emerson, W. L. "To Guard or Not to Guard." Library Journal, January 15, 1959, pp. 145-46.

Furnas, J. C. "Vandals in the Library." Reader's Digest, January, 1964, pp. 175-80.

Hoppe, R. A. and Simmel, E. C. "Book Tearing and the Bystander in the University Library." College and Research Libraries, May, 1969, pp. 247-51.

Huff, W. H. "Acquisitions of Serial Publications." Library Trends, January, 1970, pp. 294-317.

"It Shouldn't Happen to a Book Was Theme of a Recent Exhibit." Wilson Library Bulletin, February, 1964, p. 461.

Johnson, W. D. "School Library Press: A Survey of State Association Periodicals." School Librarian, Spring, 1970, pp. 21-25.

Kahler, [illegible] "Commandos of the Margins." Library Review, Spring, [illegible], pp. 324-27.

Kumar, Virendra. "Pilfering and Mutilation in Libraries." Library Herald, April, 1963, pp. 37-41.

Lawson, A. V. "Assumptions of Academic Librarians: Builders of Barriers?" Catholic Library World, December, 1969, pp. 233-37.

"Los Angeles Book Mutilator Served a Ten-Day Jail Sentence." Wilson Library Bulletin, April, 1965, p. 618.

"Malicious Mischief, British Style." Wilson Library Bulletin, May, 1963, p. 750.

Marshall, G. "Troubled by Page Slashers?" Library Journal, November 15, 1960, p. 4199.

Meals, F. F. and Johnson, W. J. "We Chose Microfilm." College and Research Libraries, May, 1960, pp. 223-26.

Narian, R. "Technique of Circulation of Journals in Special Libraries." Indian Librarian, June, 1962, pp. 33-43.

Metz, D. J. "Faculty Loan Policies in Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana." College and Research Libraries, January, 1969, pp. 45-50.

"No-Fine, Student-Faculty Common Loan Policy." ALA Bulletin, December, 1969, p. 1531.

Peterson, S. L. "Patterns of Use of Periodical Literature." College and Research Libraries, September, 1969, pp. 422-30.

Pierson, R. M. "Thoughts on Circulation: Sorry, It's Charged Out." Wilson Library Bulletin, May, 1970, pp. 951-56.

Savage, Ernest A. "Buy, Borrow--or Steal: Thieves' Methods." Library Journal, January 15, 1959, pp. 141-45.

"Sixty-College Security Study Finds Few Satisfied." Library Journal, May 1, 1968, p. 1848.

Sollenberger, J. K. "Periodicals Call Desk." Library Occurent, August, 1966, pp. 59-60.

"Student-Faculty Common Loan Policy at Stevens Institute." American Libraries, April, 1970, pp. 396-97.

"Survey Finds Reluctance to Circulate Mags in Academic Libraries." Library Journal, June 15, 1969, pp. 2391-92.

Trumper, V. M. "Problems Concerning Periodicals in the Small College Library." Southeastern Librarian, Fall, 1959, pp. 119-23.

Vallejo, R. M. "Serial Publications: Problems and Service." ASLP Bulletin, March-June, 1962, pp. 15-18.

Vickery, B. C. "Indicators of the Use of Periodicals." Journal of Librarianship, July, 1969, pp. 170-82.

Walker, E. "Serials in a College Library." Library Resources and Technical Services, Winter, 1962, pp. 79-82.

Wilson, L. "Library Roles in American Higher Education." College and Research Libraries, March, 1970, pp. 96-102.

Zimmerman, L. F. "Pilfering and Mutilating Library Books." Rub-Off, January-February and March-April, 1960, pp. 1-5.

REPORTS

Price, Bronson. Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, Data for Individual Institutions, Fall 1969. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

Wade, George H. Fall Enrollment in Higher Education 1970, Supplementary Information, Institutional Data. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.

DIRECTORIES

Steiner-Prag, Eleanor F. and MacKeigan, Helaine. American Library Directory 1970-71. New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1970.

NEWSPAPERS

New York Times. "In Moscow, Too, Readers Mutilate Library Books." September 11, 1969, p. 4.